

Appl. No. 10/080,202
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 8 December 2005

Page 11 of 13

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-4 and 9-22 are pending in the application.

The applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the final rejection and issuing a revised non-final rejection.

Because the applicants' prior remarks have been ineffective in determining the patentability of the applicants' claims, the applicants herein retract and revoke any and all prior remarks.

The Office action rejects claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over George (USP 6,606,130). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

MPEP 2131 states:

"A claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The **identical invention** must be shown in as **complete detail** as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 15, upon which claims 16-19 depend, claims a projection television that includes a processor that displays a test pattern image, receives output signals from at least two optical sensors while the test pattern image is displayed, and combines the output signals to form an adjustment measure, and a deflection signal generator that modifies a path of a projection based at least in part on the adjustment measure.

George does not teach receiving output signals from at least two optical sensors while a test pattern image is displayed, combining the signals to form an adjustment measure, and a deflection signal generator that modifies a path of a projection based at least in part on the adjustment measure.

George teaches sequentially displaying a small block "M" at the location of each of a plurality of sensors located at the periphery of a display and receiving output signals from each sensor when the block M is at the corresponding location. The applicants respectfully maintain that the movement of the block M from one location to another produces a different image, and thus George cannot be said to

Appl. No. 10/080,202
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 8 December 2005

Page 12 of 13

display a test pattern image (singular), and receiving output signals from multiple sensors while the (same) test pattern image is being displayed.

Because George fails to teach receiving output signals from at least two optical sensors while a test pattern image is displayed, combining the signals to form an adjustment measure that is used to modify a path of a projection based at least in part on the adjustment measure, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over George.

The Office action rejects claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over George. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

MPEP 2142 states:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) **must teach or suggest all the claim limitations**... If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness."

Claim 1 claims a method for adjusting a location of a raster, and claim 3 claims a method for adjusting a size of a raster. Each of these claims includes displaying a test pattern image, receiving output signals from at least two optical sensors located on opposing sides of a display screen while the test pattern image is displayed, combining the output signals to form an adjustment measure, and adjusting the location/size of the raster based on the adjustment measure.

George does not teach displaying a test pattern image and receiving output signals from at least two optical sensors while the test pattern image is being displayed.

As noted above, George teaches displaying multiple images and obtaining an output signal from a single sensor as each different image is displayed. Each repositioning of George's block M to illuminate a different sensor produces a different image.

Because George fails to teach displaying a test pattern image, receiving output signals from at least two optical sensors located on opposing sides of a display screen while the test pattern image is displayed, combining the output signals to form an adjustment measure, and adjusting the location/size of the raster based on

Appl. No. 10/080,202
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 8 December 2005

Page 13 of 13

the adjustment measure, as specifically claimed in each of claims 1 and 3, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over George.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott
Reg. 41,508
Att'y for Applicant(s)

1824 Federal Farm Road
Montross, VA 22520
Phone: (804) 493-0707
Fax: (215) 243-7525